



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

51
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/491,467	01/26/2000	Yoshifumi Sakamoto	13178(JA998-139)	8561
7590	07/26/2004			EXAMINER MA, JOHNNY
Richard L Catania Scully Scott Murphy & Presser 400 Garden City Plaza Garden City, NY 11530			ART UNIT 2614	PAPER NUMBER 13
			DATE MAILED: 07/26/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/491,467	SAKAMOTO ET AL.
	Examiner Johnny Ma	Art Unit 2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 May 2004.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,5-8 and 13-16 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,5-8 and 13-16 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.
2. Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such references or objections.
3. Applicant's arguments filed 5/14/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Particularly, applicant argues that "...Darbee et al., as previously submitted, pertains to a remote controller and fails to provide an electronic program guide in a manner set forth in the amended claims 1 and 8. To the contrary, the present invention is directed to receive the EPG data from a receiving unit and then utilizes the data in order to display the selected programs at a broadcast receiver. The construction and concept of Darbee et al. is primarily a currently employed standard remote control display." However, the examiner is unclear as to how the currently amended claims are novel in view of the references cited. As stated in applicants remarks, the amendments comprise revising the terminology in claim 8 as suggested by the examiner while concurrently incorporating the limitations of claims 3 and 4 into claim 1, and the limitations of claims 9 and 12 into claim 8, all such limitations having been addressed in the previous Office Action. Consequently the examiner has incorporated the rejections of claims 3 and 4 into that of claim 1 and the rejections of claim 9 and 12 into that of claim 8, respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 12, 13, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Darbee et al. (US 6,130,726) in further view of Donnelly (US 6,460,181 B1).

As to claim 1, note the Darbee et al. reference discloses a program guide on a remote control display. The claimed receiver having a transmitting means for transmitting electronic program guide (EPG) is met by program guide information transmitted to remote control via an IR or RF communication link to an associated set-top box (8:44-52). The claimed EPG data contained in a received broadcast data is met by program guide and advertising data signal may be combined with television channel signals on a coaxial cable to form a composite signal where the composite signal may be broadcast by a content provider, such as a cable company or satellite network, and delivered to a set-top box (8:58-66). The claimed a program display and selecting apparatus having a receiving means for receiving the EPG data transmitted from said broadcast receiver is met by remote control unit includes an IR or RF transmitting and receiving circuits (7:10,18-21). The claimed "said program display and selecting apparatus comprising a displaying means for concurrently displaying the received EPG data" is met by remote control unit having a graphic display for depicting program scheduling and/or advertising information without causing an interruption in content that is being depicted on an associated television

monitor (2:45-50). The claimed “said digital broadcast receiver periodically transmitting EPG data” is met by the rolling over of guide information at 4:00 am each day (Darbee et al. 8:20-23). Note the Darbee et al. reference also discloses that it may be desirable to transmit blocks of program guide data to the remote control unit over additional intervals or, possibly, at random times (9:14-16), which satisfies the claimed periodic transmission of EPG data. The claimed “said program display and selecting apparatus comprises an operation means for operating said digital broadcast receiver.” Is met by the Darbee et al. reference disclosing a program executed by the microprocessor enables the remote control unit to perform conventional operations including, for example, ON, OFF, Volume up or Down and Channel Up or Down functions (7:43-49), which satisfies the claimed operation means for operating said digital broadcast receiver. Note, it is understood that the remote control disclosed in the Darbee et al. reference has a communication link to the set-top box (8:50-52) and thus remote control commands are directed toward the operation of said set-top box. The Darbee et al. reference does not specifically disclose a digital broadcast receiving set-top box transmitting electronic program guide data in a received digital broadcast data. However, this is not considered a patentable distinction. Now note the Donnelly reference which discloses the transmission of program guide information in a digital signal (Donnelly 3:40-45) where transmission of television signals with programming guide information in an analog or digital signal is well known (Donnelly 3:11-16). Therefore the examiner submits that it would have been clearly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Darbee et al. reference set-top box with the Donnelly transmission of programming guide information in a digital signal broadcast

for the purpose of providing using a transmission protocol that is capable of broadcasting a greater amount of programming to a viewer.

As to claim 5, wherein said program display and selecting apparatus comprises a transmitting means for transmitting operation information inputted into said operation means to said digital broadcast receiver; and said digital receiver comprises a receiving means for receiving the operational information transmitted from said program display and selecting apparatus. The Darbee et al. reference discloses a communication link between a remote control unit and an associated set-top box (8:50-52). The Darbee et al. reference also discloses a remote control unit including IR transmitting and receiving circuits (7:10). The Darbee et al. reference does not specifically disclose a receiver comprising a receiving means for receiving the operation information transmitted from said program display and selecting apparatus but it is nonetheless inherent in the device for the purpose of establish a communication link between a remote control and set-top box.

As to claim 7, wherein said operation means selects a program to be monitored. The Darbee et al. reference discloses that if a program depicted on the display 14 of the remote control unit 10 is highlighted, one need only depress the EZ NAV key 20 to select that channel for viewing on an associated television set (11:8-11, also see Figure 1 and 8), which satisfies the claimed operation means selects a program to be monitored.

As to claim 8, note the Darbee et al. reference discloses a program guide on a remote control display. The claimed broadcast receiver comprising a transmitting means for transmitting EPG (electronic program guide) data is met by program guide information transmitted to remote control via an IR or RF communication link to an associated set-top box

(8:44-52). The claimed data contained in a received broadcast data is met by program guide and advertising data signal may be combined with television channel signals on a coaxial cable to form a composite signal where the composite signal may be broadcast by a content provider, such as a cable company or satellite network, and delivered to a set-top box (8:58-66). The claimed a receiving means for receiving EPG data transmitted from the broadcast receiver is met by remote control unit includes an IR or RF transmitting and receiving circuits (7:10,18-21). The claimed "a selecting apparatus; said selecting apparatus comprising a display means for concurrently displaying said received EPG data" is met by remote control unit having a graphic display for depicting program scheduling and/or advertising information without causing an interruption in content that is being depicted on an associated television monitor (2:45-50). The claimed "wherein said EPG data is transmitted periodically" is met by the rolling over of guide information at 4:00 am each day (Darbee et al. 8:20-23). Note the Darbee et al. reference also discloses that it may be desirable to transmit blocks of program guide data to the remote control unit over additional intervals or, possibly, at random times (9:14-16), which satisfies the claimed periodic transmission of EPG data. The claimed "and comprising an operation means for operating said digital broadcast receiver" is met by the Darbee et al. reference disclosing a program executed by the microprocessor enables the remote control unit to perform conventional operations including, for example, ON, OFF, Volume up or Down and Channel Up or Down functions (7:43-49), which satisfies the claimed operation means for operating said digital broadcast receiver. Note, it is understood that the remote control disclosed in the Darbee et al. reference has a communication link to the set-top box (8:50-52) and thus remote control commands are directed toward the operation of said set-top box. The Darbee et al. reference

Art Unit: 2614

does not specifically disclose a digital broadcast receiving set-top box transmitting electronic program guide data in a received digital broadcast data. However, this is not considered a patentable distinction. Now note the Donnelly reference which discloses the transmission of program guide information in a digital signal (Donnelly 3:40-45) where transmission of television signals with programming guide information in an analog or digital signal is well known (Donnelly 3:11-16). Therefore the examiner submits that it would have been clearly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Darbee et al. reference set-top box with the Donnelly transmission of programming guide information in a digital signal broadcast for the purpose of providing using a transmission protocol that is capable of broadcasting a greater amount of programming to a viewer.

As to claim 13, the claimed "comprising a transmitting means for transmitting the operational information input into said operation means to said digital broadcast receiver" is met by a communication link between a remote control unit and an associated set-top box (8:50-52), wherein a remote control unit including IR transmitting and receiving circuits (7:10), where it is understood operation information is transmitted via the IR communication means.

As to claim 15, the claimed "wherein said operation means selects a program to be monitored" is met by "...if a program depicted on the display 14 of the remote control unit 10 is highlighted, one need only depress the EZ NAV key 20 to select that channel for viewing on an associated television set" (Darbee et al. 11:5-11).

As to claim 16, note the Darbee et al. reference discloses a program guide on a remote control display. The claimed broadcast receiver comprising a transmitting means for transmitting EPG (electronic program guide) data is met by program guide information

transmitted to remote control via an IR or RF communication link to an associated set-top box (8:44-52). The claimed data contained in a received broadcast data is met by program guide and advertising data signal may be combined with television channel signals on a coaxial cable to form a composite signal where the composite signal may be broadcast by a content provider, such as a cable company or satellite network, and delivered to a set-top box (8:58-66). As to the claimed "receiving means for receiving the operational information transmitted from the program display and selected apparatus," please see that which is set forth in the rejections of claims 8, 12, and 13.

3. Claims 6 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Darbee et al. (US 6,130,726) in further view of Donnelly (US 6,460,181 B1) and Huang et al. (US 6,437,836).

As to claim 6, the Darbee et al. and Donnelly references discloses all the limitations of claim 4. However the Darbee et al. reference does not disclose wherein said operation means comprises a touch panel. The Huang et al. reference discloses operation means comprises a touch panel where an electronic program guide is seamlessly integrated with the remote: clicking on a program will allow one to immediately change to that program (Huang et al. 5:26-28, also see Figure 1A). Therefore, it would have been clearly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the Darbee et al. remote control with the Huang et al. remote control system to provide specialized functionality and features by dynamically constructing the user's remote control buttons on a graphical touch screen (Huang et al. 4:23-27).

As to claim 14, the Darbee et al. and Donnelly references discloses all the limitations of claim 12. However the Darbee et al. reference does not disclose wherein said operation means

Art Unit: 2614

comprises a touch panel. The Huang et al. reference discloses operation means comprises a touch panel where an electronic program guide is seamlessly integrated with the remote: clicking on a program will allow one to immediately change to that program (Huang et al. 5:26-28, also see Figure 1A). Therefore, it would have been clearly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the Darbee et al. remote control with the Huang et al. remote control system to provide specialized functionality and features by dynamically constructing the user's remote control buttons on a graphical touch screen (Huang et al. 4:23-27).

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Johnny Ma whose telephone number is (703) 305-8099. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 5:00 pm.

Art Unit: 2614

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on (703) 305-4795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jm



JOHN MILLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600